

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,351	09/28/2005	William Richard Taylor	KIPP:103US	6425
	7590 10/16/200 IMPSON, PLLC	9	EXAM	IINER
5555 MAIN STREET			THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
WILLIAMSVI	LLE, NY 14221-5406		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/551,351	TAYLOR ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	MARISSA THEIN	3627			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 Ju</u>	ıly 2009.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 5-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 and 15-22 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 5-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and applicant may not request that any objection to the	epted or b) objected to by the				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received. I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/13/06.	4)	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 5-14 in the reply filed on July 13, 2009 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-4 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on July 13, 2009.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 13, 2006 is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 recites in the preamble a system claim, however, the body of the claim does not contain any limitations indicating the structure of the device. A system or an apparatus claim should always claim the structure or the hardware that performs the function. Applicant's claimed limitations consist of product information pages and set of product producers and set of product sales organization, etc., which is data per se, and that do not describe the structure of the device. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,351 Page 3

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 5-14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 5-14 recites in the preamble "a computer-based product information system" and the body of the claim recites "product information pages", "set of product producers", etc., which are data per se. Therefore claim 24 is non-statutory because it is directed towards data, per se, lacking any structure or hardware that performs the function

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,249,772 to Walker.

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Walker discloses a system comprising: a set of product pages (col. 14, lines 41-51; col. 15, lines 17-27); a set of product producers that comprises each of the product producers within such system that have a means for providing products to said product sales organizations (Figure 6A, col. 15, lines 17-44);

Art Unit: 3627

a set of product sales organizations which comprises each of the product sales organizations within such system that have a means for displaying product information pages at points of sales where such means have product selection means for allowing customers to choose which specific product the customer wants to see the product information page (Figure 6B, col. 16, lines 14-24); and an information handling organization where said information-handling organization provides, using the central server, a first correlation list of product information page to individual product sales organization and a second correlation list correlating product producer with product information pages (central controller, col. 5, lines 12-34). Furthermore, Walker discloses means for displaying product information which are owned by the set of product producers (col. 9, lines 44-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,772 to Walker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos.

Walker substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, Walker does not explicitly discloses an authoring a product information page; commission charge;

multimedia display; navigation means; displaying product information are leased by said

information handling organization to said product sales organization.

Bezos, on the other hand, teaches an authoring a product information page; commission charge; multimedia display; navigation means; displaying product information are leased by said information handling organization to said product sales organization. (Col. 7, lines 5-60; col. 7, lines 6-20; Figures 3A-3C; Figure 8; col. 5, lines 15-25; col. 11, lines 1-26).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Walker, to include an authoring a product information page; commission charge; multimedia display; navigation means; displaying product information are leased by said information handling organization to said product sales organization, as taught by Bezos, in order to efficiently attract customers to their web site (Bezos, col. 1, lines 39-40).

Election by Original Presentation

Newly submitted claims 15-22 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claims are distinct and has separate utility such a system comprising a local server located at the retail sales location and a kiosk located in said retail sales location and linked to said local server. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for

Application/Control Number: 10/551,351 Page 6

Art Unit: 3627

prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 15-22 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARISSA THEIN whose telephone number is (571)272-6764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marissa Thein/ Examiner, Art Unit 3627 October 13, 2009